

Title II of the Higher Education Act

Institutional Report

APPENDIX C

Annual Institutional Questionnaire on Teacher Preparation:

Academic year: 2001-2002

Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education

Report Year 3: (Fall 2001, Winter, 2002, Summer 2002)

Institution name:	Maryville University		
Respondent name and title:	Dr. Katharine Rasch, Dean		
Respondent phone number:	314-529-9466	Fax: 314-529-9921	
Electronic mail address:	krasch@maryville.edu		
Address:	13550 Conway Road		
City:	St. Louis	State: MO	Zip code: 63141

Section I. Pass rates.

Please provide the information in Tables C1 and C2 on the performance of completers of the teacher preparation program in your institution on teacher certification/licensure assessments used by your state.

Program completers for whom information should be provided are those completing program requirements in the most recent academic year. Thus, for institutional reports due to the state by April 7, 2001, the relevant information is for those completing program requirements in academic year 1999-2000. For purposes of this report, program completers do not include those who have completed an alternative route to certification or licensure as defined by the state.

The assessments to be included are the ones taken by these completers up to 5 years before their completion of program requirements, or up to 3 years afterward. (Please note that in 3 years institutions will report final pass rates that include an update on this cohort of completers; the update will reflect scores reported after the test closure date.) See guide pages 10 and 11.

In cases where a program completer has taken a given assessment more than once, the highest score on that test must be used. There must be at least 10 program completers taking the same assessment in an academic year for data on that assessment to be reported; for aggregate or summary data, there must also be at least 10 program completers (although not necessarily taking the same assessment) for data to be reported.

Note: The procedures for developing the information required for these tables are explained in the National Center for Education Statistics document entitled *Reference and Reporting Guide for Preparing State and Institutional Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation: Title II, Higher Education Act*. Terms and phrases in this questionnaire are defined in the glossary, appendix B of the guide.

Section I. Pass rates.

Table C1: Single-Assessment Institution-Level Pass-rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program

<i>Table C-1</i>	<i>HEA - Title II 2001-2002 Academic Year</i>
Institution Name	Maryville University
Institution Code	6399
State	Missouri
Number of Program Completers Submitted	45

Number of Program Completers found, matched, and used in passing rate Calculations ¹	45				Statewide		
Type of Assessment	Assessment Code Number	Number Taking Assessment	Number Passing Assessment	Institutional Pass Rate	Number Taking Assessment	Number Passing Assessment	Statewide Pass Rate
Professional Knowledge							
Academic Content Areas							
Art: Content Knowledge	133	3	3	100%	96	95	99%
Chemistry	240	1	1	100%	1		
Early Childhood Education	020	7	7	100%	295	288	98%
Elem Edu: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	011	17	17	100%	1679	1606	96%
English Lang., Lit. and Comp. : Content Knowledge	041	3	3	100%	192	191	99%
Mathematics: Content Knowledge	061	3	3	100%	97	91	94%
MS English-Language Arts: Content Knowledge	049	1	1	100%	31	30	97%
MS Mathematics: Content Knowledge	069	3	2	67%	51	49	96%
MS Science: Content Knowledge	439	3	3	100%	39	97	95%
MS Social Studies: Content Knowledge	089	1	1	100%	41	40	98%
Social Studies: Content Knowledge	081	3	3	100%	276	270	98%
Other Content Areas							
Teaching Special Populations							

Table C2: Aggregate And Summary Institution-Level Pass-rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program

<i>Table C-2</i>	<i>HEA - Title II 2001-2002 Academic Year</i>					
Institution Name	Maryville University					
Institution Code	6399					
State	Missouri					
Number of Program Completers Submitted	45					
Number of Program Completers found, matched, and used in passing rate Calculations ¹	45			Statewide		
<i>Type of Assessment</i> ²	<i>Number Taking Assessment</i> ³	<i>Number Passing Assessment</i> ⁴	<i>Institutional Pass Rate</i>	<i>Number Taking Assessment</i> ³	<i>Number Passing Assessment</i> ⁴	<i>Statewide Pass Rate</i>
Aggregate - Basic Skills						
Aggregate - Professional Knowledge				10	9	90%
Aggregate - Academic Content Areas (Math, English, Biology, etc.)	45	44	98%	3275	3155	96%
Aggregate - Other Content Areas (Career/Technical Education, Health Educations, etc.)				156	156	100%

Aggregate - Teaching Special Populations (Special Education, ELS, etc.)				270	256	95%
Aggregate - Performance Assessments						
Summary Totals and Pass Rates⁵	45	44	98%	3711	3575	96%

¹ The number of program completers found, matched and used in the passing rate calculation will not equal the sum of the column labeled "Number Taking Assessment" since a completer can take more than one assessment.

² Institutions and/or States did not require the assessments within an aggregate where data cells are blank.

³ Number of completers who took one or more tests in a category and within their area of specialization.

⁴ Number who passed all tests they took in a category and within their area of specialization.

⁵ Summary Totals and Pass Rate: Number of completers who successfully completed one or more tests across all categories used by the state for licensure and the total pass rate.

Section II. Program information.

A Number of students in the regular teacher preparation program at your institution:

Please specify the number of students in your teacher preparation program during academic year 2001-2002, including all areas of specialization.

1. Total number of students enrolled during 2001-2002: **355**

B Information about supervised student teaching:

2. How many students (in the regular program and any alternative route programs) were in programs of supervised student teaching during academic year 2001-2002? **52**

3. Please provide the numbers of supervising faculty who were:

3 Appointed full-time faculty in professional education: an individual who works full time in a school, college, or department of education, and spends at least part of the time in supervision of teacher preparation students.

0 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education and full-time in the institution: any full time faculty member in the institution who also may be supervising or teaching in the teacher preparation program.

6 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education, not otherwise employed by the institution: may be part time university faculty or pre-K-12 teachers who supervise prospective teachers. The numbers do not include K-12 teachers who simply receive a stipend for supervising student teachers. Rather, this third category is intended to reflect the growing trend among institutions of higher education to appoint K-12 teachers as clinical faculty, with the rights and responsibilities of the institution's regular faculty.

Supervising faculty for purposes of this data collection includes all persons who the institution regards as having faculty status and who were assigned by the teacher preparation program to provide supervision and evaluation of student teaching, with an administrative link or relationship to the teacher preparation program.

Total number of supervising faculty for the teacher preparation program during 2001-2002: **9**

4. The student/faculty ratio was (divide the total given in B2. by the number given in B3.): **5/1**
5. The average number of hours per week required of student participation in supervised student teaching in these programs was: **40** hours. The total number of weeks of supervised student teaching required is **16**. The total number of hours required is **640** hours.

C Information about state approval or accreditation of teacher preparation programs:

6. Is your teacher preparation program currently approved or accredited by the state?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Is your teacher preparation program currently under a designation as “low-performing” by the state (as per section 208 (a) of the HEA of 1998)? ☐ Yes ☒ No

NOTE: See appendix A of the guide for the legislative language referring to “low-performing” programs.

Section III. Contextual information (optional).

A. Please use this space to provide any additional information that describes your teacher preparation program(s).

B. Missouri has asked each institution to include at least the following information.

1. Institution Mission

Maryville University of Saint Louis is an independent, comprehensive, community oriented University founded by the Religious of the Sacred Heart in 1872. It is committed to the education of the whole person through programs designed to meet the needs of traditional and non-traditional students offered in day, evening and weekend formats. Primarily an undergraduate teaching university, Maryville also offers select, high quality graduate programs in professional fields where there is evidence both of need and of corresponding institutional strength. The liberal arts and sciences are recognized as the foundation of all academic programs, including those leading to professional degrees. True to its heritage, Maryville is resolutely committed to being a university where excellence is preeminent in all endeavors, and where the Judeo-Christian tradition of the university is honored in symbol and in substance.

Teaching candidates must ensure that all students whom they teach are given access to the knowledge that they need and the opportunities to reach their fullest potential in a diverse and democratic society. Teachers are stewards for the public schools in which they teach.

2. Educational Philosophy

Maryville University’s School of Education espouses a philosophy that builds upon the progressivist movement in the United States beginning in the 1920’s. We believe that we can best prepare teacher candidates if they are actively involved in their own professional growth and development. We also believe that the candidates’ development must come from a deep understanding of content knowledge, human development and the place of the school in society. Continuing inquiry into one’s own practice is also necessary to continue to develop one’s own teaching.

Candidates develop their knowledge, skills and dispositions to teach through a carefully sequenced combination of coursework and practica. We believe that the interplay of theory and practice allows the candidate to hone their teaching skills. Heavily influenced by the writing and John Goodlad and his associates at the National Network for Educational Renewal, we believe that the teacher plays a pivotal role in the development of an informed and morally responsible citizenry in our democracy.

3. Conceptual Frameworks

Faculty members are committed to preparing teacher who, in Schon’s words, “reflect IN action” as well as “reflect ON action”. Further, the faculty believes that teachers must be makers of their own meaning, consciously reflecting intellectually and ethically upon their own beliefs and practices. Ultimately, the reflective practitioner questions “What is the role of education in shaping the society in which we live and work?”

The structure for reflection and the outcomes of our programs is further delineated by 4 strands. These provide the basis for the coursework and experiences in the program. These strands are development (student, candidate), curriculum and instruction, school and society, research and inquiry.

Developmental—

Humans grow and develop throughout every aspect of their lives. Teachers must be able to understand how their students' growth and their own personal and professional growth and development have an impact upon the teaching/learning process. The diversity of the population in the United States also suggests that growth and development is different based upon race, ethnicity, geographical location, gender, and other individual differences.

Curriculum and Instruction—

Teachers are ultimately responsible for what is taught and how it is taught. They must spend each day of their professional lives weighing decisions about how to best spend the instructional time in their classrooms and what resources to best use. Ultimately, these decisions are made from knowledge of child development, reflection upon national, state and local guidelines and their beliefs about the purposes of schooling, as well as a deep appreciation for schooling in the context of the local community. In particular, our work with the National Network for Educational Renewal has suggested that we **MUST** reflect upon the access to quality curriculum and instruction for our poor and minority children.

In today's climate that emphasizes accountability, reflection must include an analysis of state, local and national standards, the assessments that are developed to document student learning.

School and Society—

Teacher education candidates at Maryville University are asked to reflect critically with regard to the purposes of schooling in a diverse and democratic society. This reflection includes the juxtapositioning of essentialist education policies against some of the tenets of a post-modern society. This reflection should inform not only the curriculum and instruction within the school day, but also the reflection on action as the teacher reaches out to the broader community, particularly to the parents, families, and community members that the school serves.

Research and Inquiry Strand—

This strand not only acknowledges, but validates as essential, the role of current research and inquiry as a means for reflection on teacher development and practice. But this process is truly synergistic; past practice and the teacher's current practice continually inform the ways that the teacher's theory base and practice continue to develop.

4. Program completers who teach in the private schools and out of state

Private Schools:	2
Out-of-State:	